

[16th November 1922]

(2) to state what action has been taken by the Government in regard to each of the resolutions of the said conferences; and

(3) to place on the table a statement of the expenditure incurred by the local bodies for the attendance of the members of the said bodies at these conferences, and also the expenditure incurred from provincial funds for the travelling allowances of the public officials who attended the above conferences?

A.—(1) & (2) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to G.O. No. 1345, L. & M., dated 5th August 1922, a copy of which is placed on the table.*

(3) The Government have no information.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—“This question relates to the expenditure on local and municipal conferences. The Government say that they have no information. Will they call for the information?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—“I have no objection to call for the information.”

District health officer, Kurnool.

502 Q.—Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) the total expenditure incurred to maintain the newly-created office of district health officer in the Kurnool district;

(2) what his functions and the nature of work expected of him are;

(3) whether it is a fact that rural sanitation in the Kurnool district is most backward and requires the earnest attention of the department;

(4) whether with the opening of the department of health there is a corresponding reduction in expenditure incurred on the district medical and sanitary officer;

(5) whether the health officer is equipped with slides relating to the health and child-welfare exhibition held at Madras; and

(6) whether the present health officer in the Kurnool district is proficient in the vernacular of the district?

A.—(1) & (4) The Government have no information as to the total expenditure incurred. The office staff required by the District Health Officer was taken from the office of the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, Kurnool.

(2) The chief duties of a District Health Officer and his staff are given below:—

(a) To relieve the Civil Surgeon of all public health duties in the rural areas of his district.

(b) The investigation and control of all outbreaks of communicable disease in rural areas.

(c) The supervision of all vaccination and other protective inoculations at present carried out by a special staff.

(d) The supervision of the registration of vital statistics which should thus be made much more detailed and much more accurate than at present;

16th November 1922]

- (e) The drafting of plans and estimates for simple sanitary projects and taking steps to remedy defects in village drainage, water-supplies, etc.
- (f) Propaganda—This would be a very important part of the activities of the health staff. Lantern lectures, cinema lectures and demonstrations, run more or less on American lines, should play an important part.
- (g) In the event of outbreaks of cholera, plague or malaria, the disinfection of water-supplies, etc., rat destruction and plague inoculation, mosquito-reduction and the distribution of quinine would be undertaken by the public health staff.
- (h) Hookworm infestation and other such parasitic infections would be dealt with.
- (i) The staff would work in co-operation with the staffs of neighbouring districts, the interchange of notification of outbreak of infectious disease receiving attention at the earliest possible opportunity.
- (j) In the event of the appearance of infectious disease of a serious nature, the most strenuous efforts would be made to localize the spread with the aid, when necessary, of the staffs of adjoining districts.

(3) The answer is in the affirmative.

(5) The District Health Officer has been, and will be, supplied with slides on various health subjects, e.g., hookworm, general sanitation, etc., by the Director of Public Health, and, it is hoped also, by the Ankylostomiasis bureau and the Madras Health Propaganda Board.

(6) The answer is in the negative.

Defamation of Government servants in the public press.

503 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Home Member and the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(1) how many cases of alleged defamation of Government servants in the press have been brought to the notice of the Government from January 1921 up to date;

(2) in how many such cases Government have allowed proceedings to be instituted against the editors or proprietors of newspapers concerned for defamation and whether the Government will be pleased to give a list of such cases; and

(3) in how many such cases the assistance of Crown Law officers was given to the aggrieved public servants and what amount of expenditure the Government have incurred in each case and with what result?

4.—The Government are not prepared to say how many cases of the defamation of their servants by newspapers have been brought to their notice. Proceedings have been instituted in two cases—that of Mr. Pelly against the "Independent" of Allahabad and that of Mr. Hitchcock against the "Hindu" of Madras. In neither case was the assistance of the Law officers of the Crown given directly to the officers concerned but in both Government undertook to meet the cost of the litigation. In Mr. Pelly's case the expenditure amounted to Rs. 173-14-0. Mr. Hitchcock's case is still *sub judice*.